

**Remarks/Arguments:**

This is a reply to the office action of July 28, 2004. A petition for a two-month extension of time is attached.

Also attached are three replacement drawing sheets, containing Figures 1 - 5, satisfying the formal requirements for drawings. No new matter is presented.

A terminal disclaimer is enclosed to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Two words have been deleted from the specification to correct errors.

We enclose a copy of the non-patent document (Brakeman) which the examiner did not receive with the Information Disclosure Statement we filed on January 3, 2002. We believe that a new IDS is not required at this point, because our January 3, 2002 IDS directed the examiner to the parent file, where the reference was cited by the examiner, and was included in the office action of September 12, 2000. The examiner did not use the reference in a rejection in that case. We request the examiner contact the undersigned by telephone if he is unable to consider the *Brakeman* document officially for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

*Charles W. Fallow*

Charles W. Fallow  
Reg. No. 28,946

Shoemaker and Mattare, Ltd.  
10 Post Office Road  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
(301) 589-8900  
December 28, 2004

I certify that this paper is being transmitted  
on December 28, 2004 by facsimile to the  
PTO at 703.872.9306. *Charles W. Fallow*